



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/908,983	07/19/2001	Gerald E. O'Shaughnessy	E32-003	6832
3775	7590	12/06/2005	EXAMINER	
ELMAN TECHNOLOGY LAW, P.C. P. O. BOX 209 SWARTHMORE, PA 19081-0209				ZHOU, TING
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2173		

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/908,983	O'SHAUGHNESSY ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ting Zhou	2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 3,5,6,8,11-13 and 15-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 3,5,6,8,13,15-25 and 27-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 11,12 and 26 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Request for Continued Examination (RCE) filed on 8 September 2005 under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/908,983 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.
2. The amendments filed on 8 September 2005, submitted with the filing of the RCE have been received and entered. Claims 3, 5-6, 8, 11-13 and 15-53 as amended are pending in the application.
3. It is noted that the claims 11-12 and 26 were previously acknowledged as allowable subject matter dependent upon a rejected base claim, in the final office action dated 8 March 2005.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 11-12 and 26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The present invention teaches an interface that combines communications and file management. Claims 11 and 26, when taken with parent claims 30, 43 and 8 for claim 11, and parent claims 22, 24 and 25 for claim 26 as a whole, are distinct over the prior art. Each of claims 11 and 26, when taken with parent claims 30, 43 and 8 as a whole, identify the distinct feature of determining whether a first resulting message is text, and if the

first resulting message is text, adding the contents of the first resulting message as a sticker to all the other resulting messages and deleting the first resulting box from the inbox. Claim 12, when taken with parent claims 30, 43 and 8 as a whole, identify the distinct feature of if the communication is a record in the standardized format, determining whether the communication includes files which are not one of the one or more files of the communication; if the message includes files which are not one of the one or more files of the communication, determining a form of encoding for the one or more files of the communication and decoding the one or more files of the communication according to the form of encoding. The closest prior art, Microsoft Outlook (Screenshots 1-19) teaches an email program interface for filtering and manipulating email files with attachments. However, the prior art fails to teach “determining whether a first resulting message is text, and if the first resulting message is text, adding the contents of the first resulting message as a sticker to all the other resulting messages and deleting the first resulting box from the inbox”, or “if the communication is a record in the standardized format, determining whether the communication includes files which are not one of the one or more files of the communication; if the message includes parts which are not one of the one or more files of the communication, determining a form of encoding for the one or more files of the communication and decoding the one or more files of the communication according to the form of encoding”, when taken with their corresponding base and intervening claims as a whole. Thus, the prior art fails to anticipate or render the above limitations obvious.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The added negative limitation of “without a communication” to claim 45 was not explicitly described in the specification. The examiner respectfully points out that negative limitations must be positively recited, albeit negatively, in the specification in order to have basis for being explicitly excluded in the claims (MPEP 2173.05(i)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims 22-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 22-29 are not tangible. The preamble of independent claim 22 recites a “computer program product”, which is directed to software, per se, lacking any hardware to enable any functionality to be realized. The claimed features and elements of

independent claim 22 do not include hardware components or features that are necessarily implemented in hardware. Therefore, the claimed features of claim 22 is actually a software, or at best, directed to an arrangement of software, and software claimed by itself, without being executed or implemented on a computer medium, is intangible.

7. To expedite a complete examination of the instant application, the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of the applicant amending these claims to place them within the four statutory categories of invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

8. Claims and 3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 22-24 and 30-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mellin et al. WO 01/65336 (hereinafter “Mellin”).

Referring to claim 22, Mellin teaches a computer program product comprising code for receiving communications files, wherein a communication file comprises one or more application type files (receiving emails with attachments) (page 10, lines 1-14 and Figures 8 and 23); code for selecting an activity folder where an activity folder has at least one or more separate current user-defined activity folders (a plurality of user defined folders) (page 10, lines 1-14 and Figure 8); and code for associating the communications files comprising one or more application type files into separate current user defined activity folders (incoming emails can automatically be filtered into user-defined folders) (page 10, line 14-page 11, line 8), including code for allocating the separate user defined activity folders within the activity folder for each of the communication files comprising one or more application type files (users defined folders such as the “Marketing” folder are allocated within the folder “Folders”, as shown on the left-hand side of the interface of Figure 8), thereby providing an activity folder which includes related communications files comprising one or more application type files in separate user defined activity folders within one activity folder (filtering email messages into user-defined folder based on a relation, such as a common keyword, etc.) (page 10, line 14-page 11, line 8).

Referring to claim 30, Mellin teaches a method comprising automatically identifying a communication comprising one or more files of one or application types (receiving emails with attachments) (page 10, lines 1-14 and Figures 8 and 23); automatically storing each of the files of the communication as separate files in a particular activity folder and thereby automatically allowing the separate files of the communication to be manipulated from the particular activity

folder regardless of the application type (extracting attachments from emails and storing them as separate files so the attachments can be treated as separate entities) (page 17, lines 15-35 and further recited in the Abstract).

Referring to claim 3, Mellin teaches wherein the one or more files of the communication include attachment notes, file identification modifiers and external file links (Figure 23).

Referring to claims 5 and 24, Mellin teaches providing a control record for each of the one or more files of a communication in a directory location for indexing the one or more files of a communication and for each of the one or more files of the communication, providing a communications record in the activity folder (filtering the incoming emails into respective folders and displaying the email in the folder) (page 10, lines 1-14, page 11, lines 4-6, page 17, lines 16-35 and Figures 8 and 23).

Referring to claim 6, Mellin teaches displaying a folder tree (hierarchical folder tree displayed on the left-hand side of the interface shown in Figures 8 and 23); displaying the contents of an activity folder (for example, Figure 8 shows the content of the “Marketing” folder and Figure 23 shows the content of the “Document” folder); and storing the separated files of the communication as related files within the particular activity folder (extracting attachments from messages and storing them separately in a way that allows files that originated together to be grouped together) (page 17, lines 16-35).

Referring to claim 8, Mellin teaches transferring email communications and related attachments to and from a host and manipulating data included in the email communications and related attachments (sending and receiving email messages, the messages including attachments; users can further manipulate messages in folders such as move or delete the message) (page 16,

line 5-page 18, 35), the transfer including determining whether the one or more files of the communication is a record in a standardized file format, if the one or more files of the communication is a record in the standardized format, presenting the record in an ordered manner (determining if the messages is in a standardized format, i.e. matches a filtering rule such as a keyword match, and if the message does meet the filter rule, place the message in the corresponding folder) (page 9, line 22-page 11, line 32); and determining whether the one or more files of the communication is a record in a predetermined format (determining whether the email message has attached files) (page 17, lines 16-35), and permitting the user to assign the file attachments to a respective folder by allocating the file attachments folder space in a file folder of the files to which the file attachments are associated (extracting the attached files and allocating them to the “Documents” folder) (page 10, lines 1-13 and page 17, lines 16-35), wherein the activity folder comprises related attachments regardless of application type (Figure 22) and the activity folder is one of the following: a user-defined folder, a system-defined folder, a program-defined folder (page 10, lines 1-13).

Referring to claim 13, Mellin teaches executing a find routine to locate a first file in an activity folder (finding and retrieving files via a file request routine, i.e. command) (page 19, line 19-page 20, line 18 and Figures 5 and 22), making a temporary list of extended file information records (a list of matching records, or files with their corresponding extended information such as the size of the file shown in Figure 5; this is further shown in Figure 22); determining if extended file information for the file is available, if the extended file information is available, displaying file information concerning the file (displaying available extended file information for the file, such as the size of the file shown in Figure 5; this is further shown in Figure 22);

determining if a sticker note associated with the file is found and if the sticker note is found, displaying the existence of the sticker note (displaying available sticker notes, such as a description of what the file is, as shown in Figures 5 and 22); determining if tag information associated with the file is found and if the tag information is found, displaying the existence of the tag information (displaying available tag information as shown in Figures 5 and 22); and repeating the sequence until no further files are found in the folder (information available are displayed for each file found for the file request) (Figures 5 and 22).

Referring to claim 23, Mellin teaches code for accepting user inputs for file manipulation commands and performing file manipulation subroutines corresponding to the user inputs (file manipulation such as moving a message from one folder to another) (page 18, lines 21-25), wherein communication files of one or more application type files are associated with at least one activity folder as one or more file attachments (attachments are associated, i.e. stored in the “Documents” folder) (page 10, lines 1-13 and Figure 23), wherein the file attachments are located in a current user defined activity folder said file attachments including but not limited to attachment notes, file identification modifiers, and external file links (Figure 23).

Referring to claim 31, Mellin, as modified, teaches wherein the general folder structure is part of a tree directory structure maintained by the information handling system (as shown in Figure 3, folders are divided into groups; furthermore, the left-hand side of Figure 8 shows a tree structure of “Folders” and the folder under “Folders”, such as “Unfiled”, “Documents”, etc.).

Referring to claim 32, Mellin teaches wherein the activity folder comprises related files of one or more application type (for example, Figure 8 shows related files stored in the “Marketing” folder) (page 11, lines 4-6), wherein the activity folder is one of the following: a

user-defined folder, a system-defined folder, a program-defined folder (user-defined folders) (page 10, lines 8-13).

Referring to claims 33 and 34, Mellin teaches wherein the one or more files of the activity folder are related according to at least one of the following: activity, work session, project, task, operation, date, time, order, client, user input and contact information (the files can be filtered into folders according to the activity, i.e. keywords) (page 10, line 28-page 11, line 32).

Referring to claim 35, Mellin teaches wherein the method of identifying the communication includes at least one of the following: creating, receiving, accessing, storing, processing, moving, copying, and sending the communication (sending and receiving messages) (page 16, line 5-page 17, line 35).

Referring to claim 36, Mellin teaches wherein each of the one or more separate files of the communication in a particular activity folder are identified as related files of the communication (storing extracted attachment files in a way that allows files that originated together to be grouped together) (page 17, lines 16-35).

Referring to claim 37, Mellin teaches wherein manipulating includes at least one of storing, processing, accessing, deleting, sending, receiving, creating, moving, copying, viewing, renaming, and editing (users can perform operations such as storing files and retrieving files) (page 17, line 16-page 18, line 20).

Referring to claim 38, Mellin teaches wherein manipulating the separate files of the communication includes manipulating the separate files between one or more activity folders (moving the files between folders) (page 18, lines 21-25).

Referring to claim 39, Mellin teaches identifying at least one of the files of the communication from the activity folder and manipulating the identified file from the activity folder in response to a user input (users can view a list of messages, i.e. files within a folder and manipulate the file by selecting it to display the message content) (page 18, lines 8-30).

Referring to claim 40, Mellin teaches storing the manipulated one or more files of the communication with related one or more files of the activity folder (storing extracted attachment files in a way that allows files that originated together to be grouped together) (page 17, lines 16-35).

Referring to claim 41, Mellin teaches wherein the stored one or more files of the communication is identified as related to the communication in the activity folder the file is stored (linking attachment files that originated together) (page 17, lines 16-35).

Referring to claim 42, Mellin teaches wherein the communication comprising one or more files of one or more application types comprises one or more of the following: application files, document files, contact files, communication files and web files (for example, the attachments shown in Figure 23 includes files such as PDF documents, Excel application files, etc.).

Referring to claim 43, Mellin teaches wherein the communication comprises one or more files of one or more application types is identified as an email communication file and related attachments to the email communication file (receiving an email message with attachments) (page 17, lines 16-35).

Referring to claim 44, Mellin teaches wherein the communication comprising one or more files of one or more application types is identified as a text file and related attachments to

the text file (uploading text files such as documents to the folder) (page 18, lines 3-20 and Figures 8 and 23).

Referring to claim 45, as best understood by the examiner, Mellin teaches identifying one or more files of one or more application types without a communication and storing the identified files in the particular activity folder as separate files that can be manipulated from the activity folder regardless of application type (files such as documents can be stored in activity folders without a communication, for example, by being uploaded by the user) (page 18, lines 3-20).

Referring to claim 46, Mellin teaches wherein the information handling system associates an application program for each of the one or more application types of the one or more files of the communication (the attachments have associated application program, such as Excel) (Figure 22), and further comprising separating the communication upon arrival into an email communication file and one or more related attachment files of one or more application type (extracting attachments from email messages) (page 17, lines 16-35); storing the email file and the one or more related attachment files of one or more application type in the particular activity folder as related files ((extracting attachments from messages and storing them separately in a way that allows files that originated together to be grouped together) (page 17, lines 16-35); and manipulating at least one of the following: the email file and the one or more related attachment files as separate files in the particular activity folder without accessing the application program associated with the one or more application types of the one or more files of the communication (users can manipulate each extracted attached file separately, such as move the file between folders) (page 17, line 16-page 18, line 35).

Referring to claim 47, Mellin teaches wherein manipulating includes at least one of the following: storing, processing, accessing, deleting, sending, receiving, creating, moving, copying, viewing, renaming and editing (users can perform operations such as storing files and retrieving files) (page 17, line 16-page 18, line 20).

Referring to claim 48, Mellin teaches identifying at least one of the files of the communication from the activity folder and manipulating the identified file in the activity folder in response to a user input (users can view a list of messages, i.e. files within a folder and manipulate the file by selecting it to display the message content) (page 18, lines 8-30).

Referring to claim 49, Mellin teaches wherein identifying at least one of the files of the communication includes at least one of creating, receiving, accessing, storing, processing, editing, moving, copying and sending the file (sending and receiving messages) (page 16, line 5-page 17, line 35).

Referring to claim 50, Mellin teaches storing the manipulated file with related one or more files in one or more activity folder regardless of application type (storing extracted attachment files in a way that allows files that originated together to be grouped together) (page 17, lines 16-35).

Referring to claim 51, Mellin teaches wherein only one of the email message file and the one or more related attachment files are manipulated(treating each extracted attached file as a separate file) (page 17, lines 16-35).

Referring to claim 52, Mellin teaches wherein the manipulating is limited to manipulating the one or more related attachment files in the particular activity folder, without manipulating the related email file, by one or more of the following: processing, and performing operations on the

one or more related attachment file (since the attached files of an email are extracted and stored separately, users can interact with the attached files separately from the originating message) (page 17, lines 16-35 and further recited in the Abstract).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Microsoft® Outlook, copyright 1998 (hereinafter “Outlook”).

Referring to claim 53, Outlook teaches a method comprising providing a computer interface wherein a user defined activity folder comprises objects of different application types as related objects regardless of the application type (user defined directory folders, shown on the left hand side of the Outlook interface shown in Screenshot 2, comprises a plurality of emails, with a plurality of objects, or attached files of different application types, such as PowerPoint files, Excel files, etc., as shown in Screenshot 5); manipulating at least one of the objects of different application types from the activity folder of the computer interface (emails comprising the objects, or attachments of different types within the activity folders can be manipulated via selecting and opening the attached file of the email from the corresponding folder) (Screenshot 5); associating one or more functionalities with the objects of different types and coupling the

associated functionalities of the objects such that these functionalities are available to a user within the user defined activity folder (the attached files of different types has associated functionalities, such as the functionalities of allowing users to select and open the attached files, so that users can manipulate the files of the emails within the activity folders via using the functionalities of selecting and opening the attached files) (Screenshots 5 and 19).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 17-21, 25 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mellin et al. WO 01/65336 (hereinafter “Mellin”), as applied to claims 22 and 30 above, and Microsoft® Outlook, copyright 1998 (hereinafter “Outlook”).

Referring to claims 17 and 28, Mellin teaches all of the limitations as applied to claims 30 and 22 above. Specifically, Mellin teaches moving a file from one folder to another, permitting folder allocation without a requirement that the user hold a mouse button during a mouse drag operation (moving a message to another folder via selection of the “Move” button and then selection of a folder, so the user can select two buttons to move a message, instead of holding the mouse button during a drag operation) (Mellin: page 18, lines 21-25). However, Mellin fails to explicitly teach tagging file in response to a predetermined mouse click; providing

a representation of the file in a mouse “drag” representation to follow the mouse until receiving another instance of the predetermined mouse click; and providing a “release mouse click” function in response to said receiving another instance of the predetermined mouse click.

Outlook teaches an email interface for receiving and filtering messages (Outlook: Screenshot 2) similar to that of Mellin. In addition, Outlook further teaches tagging a file in response to a predetermined mouse click (the file selected by the user via a mouse click selection is tagged for user manipulation such as moving it to another folder) (Outlook: Screenshots 12-13); providing a representation of the file in a mouse “drag” representation to follow the mouse until receiving another instance of the predetermined mouse click (dragging the file until another mouse click is received, which causes the file to be dropped into the selected folder) (Outlook: Screenshots 12-13); and providing a “release mouse click” function in response to the receiving another mouse click (in response to receiving another mouse click, or releasing the clicked mouse, the release mouse click function of dropping the file into the selected folder is carried out; for example, the user selected, or tagged file via a mouse click on the file, shown highlighted in Screenshot 12 is dragged and dropped onto the “Co-workers” folder upon the release of the mouse click, as shown Screenshot 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Mellin and Outlook before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the email filing interface of Mellin to include the use of drag and drop mouse operations to move messages between folders taught by Outlook. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to provide users with basic input and operational capabilities, allowing users to easily interact with the interface.

Referring to claim 18, Mellin, as modified, teach tagging a file in response to a predetermined mouse click (the file selected by the user via a mouse click selection is tagged for user manipulation such as moving it to another folder) (Outlook: Screenshots 12-13); providing a representation of the file in a mouse “drag” representation to follow the mouse until receiving another instance of the predetermined mouse click (dragging the file until another mouse click is received, which causes the file to be dropped into the selected folder) (Outlook: Screenshots 12-13); providing a “release mouse click” function in response to receiving another instance of the predetermined mouse click (in response to receiving another mouse click, or releasing the clicked mouse, the release mouse click function of dropping the file into the selected folder is carried out; for example, the user selected, or tagged file via a mouse click on the file, shown highlighted in Screenshot 12 is dragged and dropped onto the “Co-workers” folder upon the release of the mouse click, as shown Screenshot 13), thereby permitting folder allocation without a requirement that the user hold a mouse button during a mouse “drag” operation (moving a message to another folder via selection of the “Move” button and then selection of a folder, so the user can select two buttons to move a message, instead of holding the mouse button during a drag operation) (Mellin: page 18, lines 21-25); accepting user inputs for file manipulation commands; and performing a file manipulation subroutines corresponding to the user inputs (file manipulation such as moving a message from one folder to another) (Mellin: page 18, lines 21-25).

Referring to claims 19 and 29, Mellin as modified, teach accepting user inputs for file manipulation by tagging a file in response to a predetermined mouse click (the file selected by the user via a mouse click selection is tagged for user manipulation such as moving it to another

folder) (Outlook: Screenshots 12-13); providing a representation of the file in a mouse “drag” representation to follow the mouse until receiving another instance of the predetermined mouse click (dragging the file until another mouse click is received, which causes the file to be dropped into the selected folder) (Outlook: Screenshots 12-13); providing a “release mouse click” function in response to the receiving another mouse click (in response to receiving another mouse click, or releasing the clicked mouse, the release mouse click function of dropping the file into the selected folder is carried out; for example, the user selected, or tagged file via a mouse click on the file, shown highlighted in Screenshot 12 is dragged and dropped onto the “Co-workers” folder upon the release of the mouse click, as shown Screenshot 13), thereby permitting folder allocation without a requirement that the user hold a mouse button during a mouse “drag” operation (moving a message to another folder via selection of the “Move” button and then selection of a folder, so the user can select two buttons to move a message, instead of holding the mouse button during a drag operation) (Mellin: page 18, lines 21-25); performing a file manipulation subroutines corresponding to user inputs (receiving user input of file manipulation commands such as selecting and dragging the file and carrying out the user inputted command; for example, user manipulation of the file shown in Screenshot 12 of selecting and dragging the file to the “Co-workers” folder causing the manipulation subroutine of placing the file into the “Co-workers” folder, as shown in Screenshot 13); selectively associating file attachments with selected ones of the files, and locating the file attachments in the respective folder by allocating the file attachments folder space in a file folder of the files to which the file attachments are associated (users can select email files with associated file attachments and store them into different directory folders, as shown in Screenshots 9-10 and 12-13); and the association of the

subset of the communications files with the current folder including allocating the communications files with a file folder definition of the current folder, thereby providing a common folder structure which includes communications files in individual file folders containing related user files (incoming mail files are filtered and sorted into corresponding folders containing related mail files, as shown in Screenshot 3, according to user set up rules shown in Screenshot 4).

Referring to claim 20, Mellin, as modified, teach accepting user inputs for file manipulation commands, performing a file manipulation subroutines corresponding to the user inputs (file manipulation such as moving a message from one folder to another or deleting a message) (Mellin: page 18, lines 21-25); and associating file attachments with the user selected folders, and locating the file attachments in the respective folder by allocating the file attachments folder space in a file folder of the files to which the file attachments are associated (received messages can have attached files, which can be allocated to a folder) (page 17, lines 16-35 and Figures 8 and 35).

Referring to claims 21 and 25, Mellin, as modified, teach transferring email communications to and from a host and manipulating data included in the email communications in accordance with the association of the subset of files with the folders and the allocation of the file attachments folder space (sending and receiving email messages, the messages including attachments; users can further manipulate messages in folders such as move or delete the message) (Mellin: page 16, line 5-page 18, 35), the transfer including determining whether the message is a record in a standardized file format, if the message is a record in the standardized format, presenting the record in an ordered manner (determining if the messages is in a

standardized format, i.e. matches a filtering rule such as a keyword match, and if the message does meet the filter rule, place the message in the corresponding folder) (Mellin: page 9, line 22-page 11, line 32); and determining whether the message is record in a predetermined format including association of file attachments (determining whether the email message has attached files) (Mellin: page 17, lines 16-35), and permitting the user to assign the file attachments to a respective folder by allocating the file attachments folder space in a file folder of the files to which the file attachments are associated (extracting the attached files and allocating them to the “Documents” folder) (Mellin: page 10, lines 1-13 and page 17, lines 16-35).

11. Claims 15-16 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mellin et al. WO 01/65336 (hereinafter “Mellin”), as applied to claims 22 and 30 above, and Venkatraman U.S. Patent 6,014,688 (hereinafter “Venkatraman”).

Referring to claims 15 and 27, Mellin teaches all of the limitations as applied to claims 30 and 22 above. In addition, Mellin teaches transferring email communications to and from a host and manipulating data included in the one or more related attachments of the email communications in accordance with the activity folder (sending and receiving email messages, the messages including attachments; users can further manipulate messages in folders such as move or delete the message) (Mellin: page 16, line 5-page 18, 35) and if the transfer is a receive operation, permitting input from a user to assign the file attachments to an activity folder (extracting the attached files and allocating them to the “Documents” folder) (Mellin: page 10, lines 1-13 and page 17, lines 16-35). However, Mellin fails to explicitly teach if the transfer is a send operation, determining if the recipient is tagged for encryption, and if the recipient is tagged

for encryption, sending the file in encrypted form. Venkatraman teaches an email program capable of transferring messages to and from a host (Venkatraman: column 1, lines 51-59 and Abstract) similar to that of Mellin. In addition, Venkatraman further teaches if the transfer is a send operation, determining if the recipient is tagged for encryption, and if the recipient is tagged for encryption, sending the file in encrypted form (Venkatraman: column 4, lines 61 – column 5, line 2 and column 6, line 51- column 7, line 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Mellin and Venkatraman before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the email program for sending and receiving emails of Mellin to include the ability to send encrypted emails taught by Venkatraman. One would have been motivated to make such a combination in order to provide more security and privacy for personal and confidential material that are sent via electronic messages and it further allows verification of message receipt.

Referring to claim 16, Mellin, as modified, teach accepting user inputs for file manipulation commands and performing a file manipulation subroutines corresponding to the user inputs (file manipulation such as moving a message from one folder to another or deleting a message) (Mellin: page 18, lines 21-25); and associating file attachments with selected ones of the files, and locating the file attachments in the related activity folder (received messages can have attached files, which can be stored in a folder) (Mellin: page 17, lines 16-35 and Figures 8 and 35).

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 3, 5, 6, 8, 13, 15-25 and 27-53 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

13. With respect to the 112 first paragraph rejection for failing to comply with the written description requirement, the examiner respectfully asserts that from the applicant's arguments on pages 13-16 of the response dated 8 September 2005, it appears that the negative limitation of claim 45 (namely, identifying one or more files of one or more application types "without a communication") is trying to convey the fact that the one or more files of one or more application types can be identified and stored apart from the email communication. In other words, the limitation is actually trying to claim that the files of various types are not associated with the email, instead of being without the email, whereas claim 45, as presently recited, appears to claim that attachments are received without an incoming communication. The examiner agrees that the specification of the present application satisfies the written description requirement for identifying files of one or more application types that are not associated with a communication, which is what the examiner believes the applicant is trying to claim. Therefore, the examiner suggests that the applicant changes "without a communication" to "not associated with a communication", "separate from a communication", or "apart from a communication" in order to clearly convey the intended scope of the limitation and overcome the 112 rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ting Zhou whose telephone number is (571) 272-4058. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached at (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TZ



CAO (KEVIN) NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER